

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/223,972	12/31/1998	CHARLES KEVIN SHANK	03384.0148-0	4270	
7:	590 10/29/2002				
JOHN C. GORECKI			EXAMINER		
165 HARVARD STREET NEWTON, MA 02460			VU, VIET DUY		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2154	1	
			DATE MAILED: 10/29/2002	X	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

9

Advisory Action

Application No. 09/223,972

Examiner

Applicant(s)

Art Unit 2154

Shank et al

	Viet Vu	2154	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence	address
THE REPLY FILED <u>Oct 15, 2002</u> FAILS TO PLACE further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abounder 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appea (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	andonment of this application. A amendment which places the ap	proper reply to plication in cor	a final rejection and ition for
THE PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check only a) or b)]		
a) X The period for reply expires 3 months from t	the mailing date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIR See MPEP 706.07(f).	for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS	I from the mailing	g date of the
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). T extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of detern appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce the final rejection.	nining the period of extension and the common the short common the short checked. Any reply received by the Of	corresponding am tened statutory p fice later than the	nount of the fee. The eriod for reply originally ree months after the
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	Appellant's Brief must be file R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	d within the pe the appeal.	eriod set forth in
2. \square The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \square they raise new issues that would require further	consideration and/or search (see	NOTE below);	
(b) \square they raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	better form for appeal by materia	lly reducing or	simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	a corresponding number of finall	y rejected clair	ns.
NOTE:			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	etion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s)	non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowab	le if submitted in
5. \(\mathbb{X} \) The a) \(\bigcap \) affidavit, b) \(\bigcap \) exhibit, or c) \(\mathbb{X} \) request application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not found persuasive (s		nsidered but do	es NOT place the
6.☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed by the Examiner in the final rejection.			·
7. X For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			d and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	:		
Claim(s) allowed: none			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on	is a) \square approved or	b) 🗆 disapprov	ed by the Examiner.
9. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
0. ☑ Other: See attachment.			

Serial No. 09/223,972

Response to Amendment:

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/15/02 with respect to claims
 1-12 are not deemed persuasive.

Applicant alleges that <u>Luzeski</u> does not teach using a language independent request for access the resources because JAVA is a platform independent programming language, not a language independent.

This is not found persuasive. <u>Luzeski</u> teaches using HTTP protocol for exchanging Java Applets or requests between client browser and server. Since HTTP is a language independent communication protocol, <u>Luzeski</u>'s teachings are still seen meeting the claim limitation.

Applicant also alleges that since claim 1 contain means-plusfunction language, COBRA software components should be read into the claim.

The examiner disagrees. First, it is submitted that COBRA was not explicitly cited in the present claims. Moreover, use of HTTP server was also disclosed in the present specification (see page 7, lines 16-17). Thus, reading the application of language independent HTTP protocol into the present claims is indeed consistent with the present disclosure.

Serial No. 09/223,972

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Viet Vu whose telephone number is (703) 305-9597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8:00am to 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An, can be reached on (703) 305-9678.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

VIET D. VU PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tukon

Art Unit 2154 10/28/02